JULY 9, 2021.

Re Law Enforcement Support for Nomination of Myrna Pérez to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD DURBIN,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. CHARLES GRASSLEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER SCHUMER, MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, CHAIRMAN DURBIN, and RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: As members of law enforcement, across the political spectrum, we write to express our support for the confirmation of Myrna Pérez to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. The undersigned include current and former police chiefs, sheriffs, and federal, state, and local chief prosecutors from jurisdictions throughout the United States.

Ms. Pérez' distinguished legal career includes leading the Brennan Center for Justice's Voting Rights and Election Program, serving as the Civil Rights Fellow at Relman, Dane & Colfax, and clerking for the Honorable Anita B. Brody of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and Honorable Julio M. Fuentes of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. For nearly two decades, Ms. Pérez' primary concern has been honoring the Constitution to ensure that our nation's democracy is inclusive, voting rights are protected, and elections are administered fairly.

As leaders in law enforcement, we are deeply concerned with the rule of law and view public safety as intrinsically linked with the public's confidence and trust in our nation's democracy. Ms. Pérez has spent her entire career as a civil rights attorney and public servant, frequently working alongside the law enforcement community in efforts to restore federal and state voting rights for ex-offenders disenfranchised by a felony conviction. We are confident that Ms. Pérez will bring diversity of thought and experience to the federal bench and that her conviction for what is fair and just will strengthen the integrity of our nation's judiciary.

We respectfully urge the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to swiftly advance Ms. Pérez's nomination and for the Senate to confirm this exceptional nominee without delay.

Sincerely,

Jim Bueermann, Former President, National Police Foundation, Former Police Chief, Redlands, California;

Zachary W. Carter, Former Corporations Counsel, New York, New York, Former U.S. Attorney, Eastern District of New York;

Steve Conrad, Former Police Chief, Louisville, Kentucky;

Barry Grissom, Former U.S. Attorney, Kansas;

Ronald Hampton, Former Executive Director, National Black Police Association;

Peter Holmes, City Attorney, Seattle, Washington;

John Hummel, District Attorney, Deschutes County, Oregon;

James E. Johnson, Former Corporation Counsel, New York, New York, Former Undersecretary for Enforcement, U.S. Department of the Treasury;

Joel Merry, Sheriff, Sagadahoc County, Maine, Former President, Maine Sheriffs Association;

Melba Pearson, Former President, National Black Prosecutors Association, Former Assistant State Attorney, Miami-Dade County, Florida;

Richard Pocker, Former U.S. Attorney, Nevada;

Donald Raley, Former Police Chief, Artesia, New Mexico;

Kathleen O'Toole, Former Police Chief, Seattle, Washington, Former Police Commissioner, Boston, Massachusetts, Former Public Safety Secretary, Massachusetts.

Mr. DURBIN. Several faith leaders also submitted letters, including Rev. Allison DeFoor, who wrote that Ms. Perez is ''an individual of the highest integrity. She is thoughtful and sound in her judgment and committed to principles of justice that transcend politics. She embodies the true meaning of public service and would be an exceptional federal judge.''

Ms. Perez's nomination received bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee.

In short, she is a seasoned litigator, ready to take on an important job. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting her.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

INFRASTRUCTURE BILL AND GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I am here on the floor again this evening to talk about the legislation that is before us.

One is the bipartisan infrastructure legislation that passed this Chamber with 69 votes. It is great for America. It addresses real problems we have in upgrading our infrastructure, but it also deals with competitiveness.

My colleague from Illinois just made a good point that we are in a global competition with other countries, including China. One reason we are not doing as well as we should is that the other countries are putting a lot more of their money into infrastructure—because it is good for their economies—and we are not.

As an example, China spends a lot more, as a percent of their GDP, on infrastructure than we do—much more. So bridges and roads and railways and ports—ports are a big problem right now—all of these would be improved and would make our economy, therefore, more efficient. As the economists say, that makes us more productive as a country and allows us to be able to compete globally.

Right now, with these supply chain issues, whether it is freight on the rail system or whether it is our highway system, or whether it is our port system or our waterway system, all of which need help, it would be easier for us to deal with this transition we are going through if we had better infrastructure.

This infrastructure bill, unfortunately, has gotten intertwined with another bill over in the House of Representatives. So, although it passed here on its own merits—standing alone as an infrastructure bill with no new tax increases, no tax increases—when it got to the House of Representatives, the Speaker of the House wanted to combine it with another bill, which is what has been called around here the reconciliation bill, which refers to a process here in the U.S. Senate—a rare process—where, instead of having the normal 60 votes—a supermajority for legislation—under reconciliation, a couple of times a year, you can have something that only needs to get 50 votes, assuming that you have the Presidency in your party because then the Vice President, as the President of the Senate, can come and break the tie to get to 51. So that is the reconciliation process that the Democrats want to use for this other bill.

What is the other bill?

It is a huge tax-and-spend bill.

Just as I believe infrastructure would be good for our country, it is actually counterinflationary based on the economists.

Why?

Because you are doing long-term investments in capital assets. That is good for pushing back against inflation. More spending on social programs, which is what is in the reconciliation bill, would add to inflation at a time when we already have a huge problem there.

Also, the huge amount of spending would be unprecedented. We will talk about that in a minute, depending on how much spending is in there.

So that is one bill, and the infrastructure bill is separate.

I, again, call on my colleagues in the House of Representatives—the leadership over there—to let the infrastructure bill go, allow it to be voted on on its merits. Don't tie it as a political hostage to this reconciliation bill, the tax-and-spend bill, that the Democrats have had a really hard time passing through the system. Infrastructure needs to stand on its own. The American people deserve that. It has been almost 3 months—almost 3 months—since the Senate passed it, and people are waiting, and they deserve the help.

By the way, it helps in a broad range, not just on the roads and bridges and the rail and the ports and the waterways I talked about; it helps with resilience to push back against an actual disaster—something all of our States are experiencing.

It is something that helps with regard to our energy policy—it makes us more competitive—and, yes, it encourages us to use the resources we have but to do so through carbon capture. And it encourages us to move to more electric vehicles; it encourages us to be more competitive on that front as well.

Infrastructure means, also, digital infrastructure. It actually, for the first time ever, provides a huge boost to having high-speed broadband spread all around the country, particularly in our rural areas, like in Ohio, where we have some areas—about a third of our State—that do not have access to it. People can't do the appropriate telehealth that they want to do. They certainly can't do the telelearning they want to do. It is difficult to even go to school these days and do your homework if you don't have access to the internet. Of course, it helps us back in Ohio, if we have the internet, to be able to start businesses in these rural areas of Ohio.

So this is all in the infrastructure bill. That is why, again, it got 69 votes here in the U.S. Senate. That is not usual around here. It is truly bipartisan. President Biden says he will sign it. Let's pass it. If we pass it in the House, it will be signed into law, and it will begin to help our country at a time when we need the help.

We also could use a little bipartisanship around here, don't you think?

This is one we can agree on.

Why should it be held political hostage to something that is strictly partisan and controversial and, in my view—in my view—would be dangerous to our economy right now?

Now, why do I say that?

Well, this new spending that would be in the bill would be the highest level of spending that we have ever seen in the U.S. Congress. Remember, originally it was $3.5 trillion because originally it was $6 trillion, and then $3.5 trillion. Now there is discussion—I just read a report this afternoon in one of the media sources—saying it may be as low as $2 trillion—$2 trillion. That is two thousand billion dollars in additional spending at a time of record deficits and debt.

Now, people say: Well, that is a lot less than 3.5.

Yes, but it would still be the largest bill ever passed by the U.S. Congress—ever. The $1.9 trillion that was passed in March—not that long ago—which was supposed to be for COVID but most of which is not going for COVID purposes, was the largest ever. This would be $2 trillion—a little larger than that—adding up together to almost $4 trillion of new spending.

Again, when the $1.9 trillion was passed, a lot of people said, including me: This is a risk to our economy right now. We are coming out of the pandemic with a growing economy. Why overheat the economy right now?

But we did, and it caused much of the inflation we are now experiencing.

The Secretary of the Treasury under the Obama administration and an economist in the Clinton administration, Larry Summers, a Democrat, said the same thing, and he continues to say it today because he believes that all of this new spending is going to add to more overheating of the economy and more inflation.

We don't need that right now. We have inflation that is not transitory. It, unfortunately, looks like it is very much permanent in terms of this year and next year, at least.

That is a huge problem because it is the lower-income and middle-income workers who are hurt the worst. It is a tax—a hidden tax. So, for the people who are seeing wage gains this year, those are being eaten up, for the most part, by inflation. The annual inflation right now, based on the last month, is 5.4 percent. So, unless your wage rate is above that, you are in trouble.

Plus, everything is just more expensive. So gasoline, if you go to the pump, is 42 percent higher this year as compared to last year—42 percent. Natural gas is expected to be in about that range, about 40 percent higher.

I did some research recently about pumpkins—you know, we are going into the holiday season this year—for Halloween.

What does a pumpkin cost?

Well, guess what. It costs, on average, 14.7 percent more this year as compared to last year. Groceries, clothes, your utility bills—everything is going up. So it is not the time to pump a lot more stimulus spending into the economy, which, again, people say is going to lead to higher inflation on everything.

Remember, before the pandemic started, back in February of 2020, we had a strong economy. We had the 19th straight month then of wage gains of over 3 percent every month for 19 months. Exactly what we wanted—right?—were wages going up. We had the lowest poverty rate in the history of our country since we started keeping track of it back in the 1950s. We had the lowest unemployment rate ever for certain groups in our economy—Hispanics, Blacks. We had the lowest unemployment ever, overall, for the last 50 years. So things were going pretty well.

Yet, now, when we look at what is happening, we are not seeing these wage increases. In fact, on average, when you take inflation into account, they say that during the Biden years, during the Biden administration over the last several months, wages have gone down an average of 1.9 percent largely because, again, of this inflation.

The legislation also includes big tax increases so it is not just about more spending; it is also about tax increases to pay for the spending. In recent days, it has come out that some of these tax hikes might not be supported by all Democrats, so they might not be able to include them all. I suppose, you know, that would be better for the economy, but as the economy is coming out of the pandemic and growing, the last thing we want to do is to raise taxes. Again, back in 2017, when tax reform occurred, it had a lot of good impacts, including, again, higher wages; we talked about the poverty rate; we talked about unemployment being low.

Another thing that it did on the global competitiveness side, on the international side, is that it actually changed the way our economy worked. Prior to that, you had a number of companies that literally were voting with their feet and leaving the United States of America because of the Tax Code. It drove all of us crazy—Democrats and Republicans alike—that you had companies that were inverting, as they say, and these inversions meant a company that was a U.S. company one day became a foreign company the next day.

This happened in Ohio. We had companies leaving Ohio to become Irish companies, as an example, because they had a lower tax rate, and we had the highest corporate tax rate of any of the developed countries, of the countries in the OECD.

That is a terrible thing. Of course, we wanted to stop that, so we put the reforms in place to say: We are going to lower our rates so our rate is competitive, and we are going to change the way we tax internationally.

And guess what. All of the inversions stopped—all of them.

And now, unbelievably, the administration and the Democratic leadership want to raise those taxes again—once again, to make us uncompetitive globally. And, again, you will see some companies say, when they look at the analysis from, you know, their tax experts: Why are we an American company?

You would hope no company would ever do that, but they were doing it before 2017. During the Obama administration, at the beginning of the Trump administration, they were leaving. So we don't want that to happen again.

In fact, we want our workers and our businesses to be competitive. I say ''workers'' because, when you raise the business taxes, guess who takes the hit. Ask the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, here. What CBO will tell you, which is a nonpartisan group here in the U.S. Congress, is that their analysis is that about 70 percent of the increase in corporate taxes is borne by workers; about 70 percent of the cut in taxes helps workers—higher wages, higher benefits. The Tax Foundation has the same analysis. The Joint Committee on Taxation, when they look at this legislation before us, the 3.5 trillion that was reported—that was introduced—they said it will raise taxes on middle-income workers, well below 400,000. A lot of that was because of this issue—because, again, the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation up here in Congress looked at it and said: Well, who is going to bear the brunt of this? It is going to be workers. So workers' wages are going to go down if you raise taxes on these individual companies that are global companies.

So that is what we are facing. Now, again, it looks like there are going to be some changes in the legislation. I mentioned that the amount may go down some. I mentioned $2 trillion, still the largest spending bill ever.

I, also, on the tax front, am told that some of the tax hikes may be taken out; some of them may be kept in. One that they are talking about keeping in—that the administration, in particular, seems adamant about keeping in—I just don't get because it, again, makes our companies less competitive globally.

It is a complicated provision in the international tax code. It is called the global intangible low-taxed income, also known as GILTI. What does GILTI say?

Well, when we changed our Tax Code back in 2017, we put in place, in effect, a minimum tax for our companies that do business overseas.

Our competitive countries—countries like ours, developed countries—for the most part, almost all of them do not tax their companies for their foreign income. So if a company—I mentioned Ireland earlier—from Ireland or Germany, whatever, does business over here, their government doesn't tax them on the income they get from the United States. It lets the United States handle that.

And we changed our Tax Code to say, well, we are not going to do that either, but we are going to add a minimum tax no matter what, and that was called the GILTI tax. It was put in place in 2017 as part of, again, a broad and successful group of tax reforms that took bold steps to reassert our competitiveness, and it worked.

They took our rate from 35 percent down to 21 percent, putting it at about the middle of the developed countries. Now it is actually above the middle because other countries have gone below us again.

We went to what is called a territorial-type system. So it all worked.

About over 1.5 trillion was reinvested in America, by the way, from overseas. So it worked in that sense too. We stopped the corporate inversions.

But this GILTI, or the minimum tax on foreign income, was put in place as a way to make sure that foreign income wouldn't be shifted to low-tax jurisdictions.

Right now, this GILTI rate stands at 13.125 percent. So it is 13 percent, roughly, for American companies. Again, most of our competitors don't have it at all, but it is 13 percent.

Treasury Secretary Yellen has now worked with countries around the world to say everybody ought to have a global minimum tax, and she has made progress on that. So some of these countries that have not had a minimum tax are now looking at one and to put one in place. The one that she wants for everybody is 15 percent.

So here we are, globally telling these other countries in the world: You have to have a global minimum tax of 15 percent. OK. So wouldn't you think, then, you would want America not to have a tax above that amount?

No, they want to change the GILTI amount from 13.125 percent to an effective rate of 17.4 percent. They started off at 21 percent in the original introduced bill. But even 17.4 percent—why would you want to put American companies above, again, this global average of 15 percent? If you are going to require companies to go to 15, why would you want the United States to be above that? But that is what is being proposed—believe it or not.

And, by the way, they are saying that we would go ahead and go to 17.4 percent before any other countries in the world would have to do it—2 years before they would have to do it. Whether they do it or not is a question.

Let's be honest. Some countries don't want to do it, and they may not do it. Their legislatures may not let them do it.

But let's assume that they do follow suit. We would be out there 2 years earlier with a higher tax rate on our workers. Remember who bears the brunt of this tax increase. Our companies would be noncompetitive. Our workers would be noncompetitive.

So I would hope that, as my colleagues are looking at this—I know it seems easy: Let's just tax the international companies—that they would look at what happened in 2017, the positive impacts of that and the negative if we reverse course and go back and raise our taxes above what other countries charge.

By the way, to do this would mean nullifying tax treaties that we have with other countries all around the world because it is a different way of approaching it. We do not have a minimum tax in place now. So the tax treaties would have to be amended. That means, obviously, to me, that you would have to have a tax treaty change here in America. In other words, you can't change tax treaties just on one side. It is bilateral. So we would have to change our tax treaties here.

Treaties have to go through the U.S. Senate. As you probably know, they have to go through the U.S. Senate, and it is a two-thirds vote to change a treaty. There is a reason for that. It is part of our checks and balances to be sure that treaties, which are a very serious undertaking, are something that you get a strong bipartisan support for.

And yet my understanding is that the Secretary of the Treasury and others in the administration are saying that they are not sure that we have to get this GILTI change or these treaty changes that we have with other countries through the U.S. Senate. We just might do it through some other way, administratively or through an Executive legislative action.

I sure hope they don't do that. That would set a terrible precedent. It would mean that this whole constitutionally based rule we have with regard to treaties would be very difficult to uphold in the future for anything.

Let me be clear. This is bad for workers as well as bad for companies. The National Association of Manufacturers just did a recent study, and they found that hiking the GILTI rate in a way we just talked about could cost up to 1 million U.S. jobs.

Again, CBO here in the Capitol, the Tax Foundation, the Joint Committee on Taxation—all of them believe this would saddle our workers with lower wages and lost jobs by making our businesses less competitive globally.

I am also concerned that the administration is talking about imposing a burdensome new information reporting requirement that would require far more information from taxpayers than is needed to enforce our tax laws. That represents an unprecedented invasion of taxpayer privacy.

You have probably heard about this because it is getting more and more attention—the so-called $600 limit. Now, this would mean that the IRS would receive a report from you every year for any expenditure. Think about an expense or a payment going in or out of your checking account of $600 or more.

Recently, again, based on a report I saw today, the administration and Democratic leadership here on Capitol Hill are talking about changing that $600 to $10,000. So it would be a higher threshold. Now, that higher threshold is something that most Americans would reach pretty quickly.

Think about it. Ten thousand dollars a year in total expenditures. Eight hundred thirty dollars per month is what that is.

So think about that: Do you spend 830 bucks a month on groceries, gas, clothes, essentials? If you do, then be prepared for the IRS to be able to look through your tax records in ways they never have before.

Don't get me wrong. I believe enforcing our tax laws is important, and I am actually one of the Republicans—there may not be many of us—who believes that the IRS should have more resources for things like improving their computer system because it is so antiquated.

I spent 2 years of my life studying this. Several years ago I came up with some reforms out of a commission. We improved it. It needs to be improved again.

The computer systems they have, both the software and the hardware, and, frankly, their ability to use them, is way outdated, and it is not good for taxpayers. It is bad for small business, and it is bad for individuals because the right hand often doesn't know what the left hand is doing. So I am for that. I am for better taxpayer service and providing more funding for that.

But I am not for providing tons more data to the IRS that has nothing to do with income that is unprecedented that their systems cannot handle. There is no way that they would be able to handle these millions and millions of new data that they would be getting from all of us—hundreds of millions of accounts from financial institutions; e-payment apps, like Venmo; and cryptocurrency exchanges, like Coinbase, are going to be subjected to more paperwork and confusion if this happens.

If you have one of the 403 million active PayPal accounts, watch out. Your personal account information may be sent to the IRS. And, boy, that is going to result in some confusion at some point.

Again, if you are one of the vast majority of Americans who spend more than 830 bucks a month on anything, then you are going to have to report that.

So there are some people who are pretty smart about this, who have looked at it and said: This doesn't make sense.

One of them is Steven Rosenthal. He is at the left-leaning Tax Policy Center. He stated that this would ''bury the agency in a sea of unproductive information.''

That is how I feel about it. Again, I would like to have the IRS be better in terms of what they could do with technology and be able to handle their job better to be able to ensure that every taxpayer gets a fair shake, because sometimes, right now, again, the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing because their computer system is so antiquated—software, hardware, everything. But as he said, they can't handle the data they have.

Mark Everson, who is a former IRS Commissioner, wrote a really interesting op-ed that I read yesterday. He wrote that this proposal would ''prove all but impossible for the IRS to handle and engulf the service in a damaging political firestorm.'' That is from Mark Everson.

By the way, Mark Everson wants to give the IRS more money to improve their computer systems. He thinks there is not enough enforcement with regard to partnerships right now, as an example, or he thinks taxpayer service should be improved. So he is not someone who says we should starve the IRS, but he is saying: Don't do this. Don't do this, add this new information reporting that is not information about income and that the IRS is not going to be able to handle, and it is an intrusion into our lives that is unnecessary.

That is in the legislation.

So, again, I have come down to the floor here every week since the original introduction of this tax-and-spend legislation we have talked about today. This is the sixth straight week that I have come to the floor. When we are in session, every week, I am going to come—continue to come—as long as this bill is out there, because I want the American people and my colleagues to know what is in this legislation and why it would be so damaging to our country right now.

And, again, I distinguish the infrastructure bill—good for the economy, the right thing to do to counter inflation; something every President in modern times has tried to do, by the way, for good reason. Let it stand on its own. It should be voted on, on its own merits. Don't entangle it with this tax-and-spend legislation that is reckless, at a time of rising inflation and higher debts and deficits, at a time when our economy is finally getting on its feet. Let's not add job-killing tax hikes. Let's not add this massive new spending.

It is in our national interest to move forward with regard to the infrastructure bill, and it is in our national interest to stop the reckless tax-and-spend legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Alabama.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, after being in Washington, DC, for 10 months, I have seen this town jump from one issue to another. Sadly, many of the issues we face are self-inflicted—illegal immigrants on the southern border, Americans who remain trapped in Afghanistan, and rampant inflation, just to name three.

But we face a more serious threat in this Nation, an issue larger than left or right, a threat that goes beyond conservative and liberal—China.

China seeks to shackle the United States economically, technologically, and militarily. The Communist leaders of China are employing every instrument of national power to diminish our standing and influence in the world. Last month, President Biden told world leaders during his maiden U.N. General Assembly speech that the United States ''is not seeking a cold war.'' Well, the United States may not be seeking out a new Cold War, but China is, so we shouldn't give them the shovel to bury us.

When asked this week if China's hypersonic missile testing over the summer was a surprise to U.S. officials, White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki joked that the Biden administration ''welcomes stiff competition.'' Businesses that are struggling under unfair competition from China didn't laugh at the Press Secretary's joke.

Intelligence analysts who watch week after week as China hacks its way to technological superiority know the competition is cheating.

Military leaders who stand the watch for us worry that the United States public may be asleep at the wheel to this enormous threat.

In 2001, then-Senator Biden said:

> The United States welcomes the emergence of a prosperous integrated China on the global stage because we expect this is going to be a China that plays by the rules.

President Biden, China is not playing by the rules.

The Director of National Intelligence, Avril Haines, said the following in her Annual Threat Assessment:

> The Chinese Communist Party . . . will continue . . . to . . . undercut . . . the United States, drive wedges between Washington and its allies and partners, and foster . . . international norms that favor the authoritarian Chinese system.

The four-star admiral in charge of our nuclear overwatch, ADM Charles Richard, warned the country that China's growth and strategic nuclear capability was ''breathtaking.''

To those paying attention, we know that China seeks to play a very dangerous game—a game they intend to win and a game they will win unless we stand united as a nation and work together to face this growing threat.

So let's take a look at the most recent breathtaking development. China recently conducted their ninth hypersonic missile test since 2014—their ninth.

By the way, 2014 was when then-President Obama was forced to start investing in missile defense after he ended or slowed funding for several programs early in his first term.

What was important about China's most recent test, however, is that it showed off China's advanced space capabilities. Hypersonic missiles are weapons that fly at more than five times the speed of sound, 3,800 miles per hour. They don't follow a fixed trajectory; their path is flexible and maneuverable. This is what makes them so hard to defend against.

A recent congressional report on hypersonic weapons revealed that the United States will not have a defensive capability against hypersonic weapons until the mid-2020s at the earliest.

Unlike our government, which, by the way, is wasting money on civilian climate corps and bailing out poorly run liberal blue States, China spends its resources on deadliness—a new and larger navy, a modernized nuclear arsenal, advanced space assets, and artificial intelligence. Yes, China is moving ahead and investing in killing machines.

Developing hypersonics is costly. The Pentagon noted as much recently, which is ironic given how little this administration has showed it cares about throwing trillions of dollars around on other programs not related to national security. China continues to outspend us on national security. In just the last 10 years, China's defense spending has increased by $200 billion, while we, the United States of America, have decreased by $400 billion.

That brings me to a very important point. Senator SCHUMER needs to bring up the National Defense Authorization Act for a vote here on the Senate floor. Every year since 1960, we have passed the National Defense Authorization Act, better known as the NDAA. The NDAA is one of few bills that the House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, work together on. That is because our military deserves it, and our national security depends on it.

One of the most important items we agreed on this year in the NDAA was that our military needs more support.

Earlier this year, President Biden sent Congress a laughable military budget. In a stunning referendum on the President's disappointing and dangerous military budget, Democrats and Republicans on the Armed Services Committee came together to increase our military budget by $25 billion.

You know, we cannot ask our military to do more with less. We cannot expect our military to defend new threats from our adversaries like China without the resources required to do the job. Republicans understand this. We have continuously fought to prioritize national security. Democrats on the Armed Services Committee also understand this. So I would like to ask